



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/382,621	08/25/1999	DAVID CHARLES REED	TU9-99-034	5475

24033 7590 12/17/2003

KONRAD RAYNES VICTOR & MANN, LLP
315 SOUTH BEVERLY DRIVE
SUITE 210
BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212

EXAMINER

ZHEN, LI B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2126

DATE MAILED: 12/17/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/382,621

Applicant(s)

REED ET AL.

Examiner

Li B. Zhen

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 3-5, 14-16 and 25-27 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 11 and 23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2, 6-10, 12, 13, 17-22, 24 and 28-32 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 6.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Allowable Subject Matter

1. Claims 3 – 5, 14 – 16 and 25 – 27 are allowed.
2. Claims 2, 6 – 10, 12, 13, 17 – 19, 21, 22, 24 and 28 – 32 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 20 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the claim objection due to minor informalities, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 20 is objected to because of the following informalities: claim 20 (line 1) refers to the system of claim 8; however, claim 8 is a method claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 11 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,078,932 to Haye in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,438,543 to Kazi.

As to claims 1, 11 and 23, Haye teaches input parameter comprises at least one extent that defines a range of tracks between a beginning track and end track (a data

Art Unit: 2126

collection, as indicated in Step 34, represented in any appropriate format such as a list of devices each containing a list of track extents; column 5, lines 23 – 33). Haye does not explicitly teach merging the parameter list according to a threshold.

However, Kazi teaches (col. 2, lines 9 – 57; col. 12, lines 13 – 35) receiving a plurality of input parameters (providing a name list for names extracted from documents to be coreferenced prior to or upon entry of a query by a user), determining whether a number of the input parameters exceed a threshold number of parameters that are capable of being included in the command (comparing contexts of the mergable names against the exclusive sets to merge the mergable names to the exclusive sets exceeding a predetermined threshold to form an aggregated cross-document name list), merging content of multiple input parameters into at least one output parameter if the number of input parameters exceeds the threshold number (If the threshold is exceeded, the mergable name will merge with the exclusive set it matched best in block 530), wherein the content of the input parameters is included in a number of output parameters that does not exceed the threshold (aggregated cross-document name list including a list of variant names for the entity), and including the output parameters with the command (providing a list of documents to the user referencing the variant names and the name of the entity used for the search query).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teaching of merging a parameter list according to a threshold as taught by Kazi to the invention of Haye because this decreases the number of

Art Unit: 2126

parameters in the parameter list (col. 2, lines 50 – 52 of Kazi) and reduces the amount of memory required to store the parameter list.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

"Improving Module Reuse by Interface Adaptation" by Purtilo and Atlee teaches extracting necessary arguments from the actual parameter list, creating a new parameter list, and completing the invocation with the new parameter list.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Li B. Zhen whose telephone number is (703) 305-3406. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri, 8am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A. Follansbee can be reached on (703) 305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Li B. Zhen
Examiner
Art Unit 2126



lbz
December 11, 2003

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100